PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNAT	IONAL SEARCHING AUTI	IORITY						
To: GARY J. CONNELL SHERIDAN ROSS P.C. 1560 BROADWAY, SUITE 1200 DENVER, CO 80202				PCT EITTEN OPINION OF THE SONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY				
DEIN	7ER, CO 60202		INTERNATI					
				(PCT Rule 43bis.1)				
			Date of mailing (day/month/year) 7 OCT 2008					
Applicant's	or agent's file reference		FOR FURTHER A					
5941-79-	1-PCT			See paragraph 2 below				
Internation	al application No.	International filing date	•	Priority date (day month year)				
PCT/US		23 July 2008 (23.0		23 July 2007 (23.07.2007)				
IPC(8) -	al Patent Classification (IPC A61K 31/498; A61K 31 514/266.24; 514/357	or both national classifica (4406 (2008.04)	ation and IPC					
	THE REGENTS OF T	HE UNIVERSITY OF	COLORADO					
I. This o	pinion contains indications r	elating to the following ite	ms:					
	Box No. I Basis of the	pinion						
	Box No. II Priority							
	Box No. III Non-establis	nment of opinion with rega	ard to novelty, inventiv	e step and industrial applicability				
	Box No. IV Lack of unity	of invention						
	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis. 1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability: citations and explanations supporting such statement							
	Box No. VI Certain docu	ments cited						
	Box No. VII Certain defe	ts in the international app	lication					
	Box No. VIII Certain obse							
	DOX NO. VIII Certain dese	Tutions on the internal						
2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.								
l o xxreitt	If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.							
	rther options, see Form PCT							
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.								
Name and r	Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of			Authorized officer:				
Commissione	Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents Commissioner for Patents 25 September 20			Lee W. Young				
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. 571-273-3201				PCT Helpdesk: 571-272-4300 PCT OSP: 571-272-7774				

Facsimile No. 571-273-3201

International application No.

PCT/US 08/70924

Box	No. I	Basis of this opinion
1.	With r	the international application in the language in which it was filed. a translation of the international application into which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
2.		This opinion has been established taking into account the rectification of an obvious mistake authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43bis.1(a))
3.	establi a. typ	egard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, this opinion has been shed on the basis of: e of material a sequence listing table(s) related to the sequence listing mat of material on paper in electronic form e of filing/furnishing contained in the international application as filed filed together with the international application in electronic form furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search
4.		In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
5.	Additi	onal comments:

International application No.

PCT/US 08/70924

Box No.	III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability				
The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of					
	the entire international application				
\boxtimes	claims Nos.				
b					
becau	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international search (specify):				
	11.61				
\boxtimes	the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. 11-61 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):				
Claims 11	-61 are dependent claims and are not drafted in accordance with the second and third sentences of Rule 6.4(a).				
	the claims, or said claims Nos are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):				
\boxtimes	no international search report has been established for said claims Nos.				
	a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the sequence listing; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit:				
	furnish a sequence listing on paper complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable				
	to it. furnish a sequence listing in electronic form complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable				
	to it. pay the required late furnishing fee for the furnishing of a sequence listing in response to an invitation under Rule 13 ter.1(a) or (b).				
	a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the tables related to the sequence listings; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit, furnish such tables in electronic form complying with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions, and such tables were not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.				
	the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in electronic form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.				
	See Supplemental Box for further details.				

International application No.

PCT/US 08/70924

Box No. V	Reasoned statement un citations and explanation		is.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial appling such statement	cability;	
1. Statemen	nt				
		Claims Claims	1-10 none	_ YES NO	
		Claims	none	YES	
mven	are step (15)	Claims	1-10	_ NO	
Indus	trial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-10	YES	
		Claims		_ 110	
industrial applicability (IA) Claims					

International application No. PCT/US 08/70924

Supplemental Box							
In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient. Continuation of: Box No. V Citations and Explanations							
As to claim 4, Witta teaches a method for treating cancer in a patient comprising administering to a patient a combination of MS-275 and a least one epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) inhibitor (p 944, abstract). Witta does not expressly teach wherein the cancer is head and neck cancer. However, this element would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the reasons setforth in claim 1. Specifically, there are close parallels between lung cancer and head and neck cancer. Mendelsohn teaches that head and neck cancer of epithelial origin (p 2787, abstract) and like other cancers of epithelial origin, is responsive to EGFR inhibitor therapy (p 2787, abstract). An ordinarily skilled artisan would have readily appreciated that E-cadherin expression is downregulated not only lung or breast cancer cells, as taught by Witta and Eger respectively, but in all cancer cells of epithelial origin, including head and neck cancers. This would have provided a motive for combination treatment of head and neck cancer with MS-275 and EGFR inhibitor to circumvent and enable effective treatment of EGFR resistant cancer cells.							
Claims 1-10 have industrial applicability as defined by PCT Article 33(4) because the subject matter can be made or utilized in industry.							